succession. The Cutchi Memons in Cochin are following the Mohammedan Law. Almost all the prominent Cutchi Memons have left wills by which the successors are ordained to succeed. That is a very good illustration of the sense of the community on this matter, and I have not come across any gentleman who raised a voice of discord in this matter. I have nothing more to say with regard to this matter but to place these facts before the House.

Question proposed: *That the Cutchi Memon's Succession Bill be read in Council.*

Question put and agreed to, Government remaining neutral.

Deputy President.—It is not necessary to ascertain their views because it is a small community.

Mr. K. Mohamed Seethi.—I should think that there must be a Committee.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Some little things may be ascertained.

Secretary to the Council.—The title of the Bill is "the Cutchi Memon's Succession Bill."

Mr. K. Mohamed Seethi.—I beg to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—

Messrs. A. K. Kunhi Moideen,
M. K. Raman,
P. Krishna Menon,
Thomas Manjuran and
A. B. Salem.

Deputy President.—The mover and the Government Advocate are the other Members. The report should be submitted within 3 months.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Question put and agreed to.

Deputy President.—I nominate the Government Advocate as the Chairman.

11. Bill to amend the Cattle Trespass Regulation.

Deputy President.—Next is the motion of Mr. K. T. Mathew to introduce the Bill to amend the Cattle Trespass Regulation. The Member is absent.

Hence the motion was considered withdrawn.

12. Cochin Small Holdings Bill.

Deputy President.—Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja may move to introduce his Cochin Small Holdings Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—I don't move.

Hence the motion was considered withdrawn.

13. Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill.

Deputy President.—Then Mr. V. D. Ouseph's Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—I beg to move that the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill be read in Council.

Mr. M. K. Raman.—I second it.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—I oppose it.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—I do not think that there can be a more innocent Bill than this one. This has been drafted on the lines of the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Act of British India when it was in force for more than half a century. There was, to my knowledge, no opposition to that enactment in British India, and conditions there are not in any way different from what they are here to-day. The purpose of the Bill appears very clear from "Objects and Reasons". All persons by birth become attached to particular communities following particular religions, such as Hinduism, Mahomedanism, Christianity, etc. Unfortunately, we find that, according to the religious usages obtaining in certain communities, the moment that their members change their religion or lose their caste, they forthwith lose all their civil rights in family properties. Of course this rule does not obtain in all communities. It is a characteristic feature of Hinduism. If its members lose their caste either voluntarily, that is, by renunciation or change of religion or where its members are compelled to go out of caste on account of excommunication, the law is that he cannot claim any rights so far as family properties are concerned. The present Bill is intended to remove such disabilities. When a person voluntarily changes or goes out of his religion, he does so either for temporal or for spiritual benefit or for both. So far as temporal purposes are concerned, such a course is necessitated on account of certain social rules such as untouchability, unapproachability, etc. When an Ezhuva becomes a Buddhist or a Christian or a Mahommedan, he does so for one or more of the above reasons, and would it not be rather cruel that he should thereby lose all his civil rights in family properties? The fate of those who lose caste on account of excommunication is harder still. There are, as we all know, functionaries in all communities to exercise the power of excommunication. Even supposing that they do their work honestly, very often their conclusions may go wrong, and is it not very cruel, may I ask, that the person excommunicated should always be further penalised by being deprived of all his rights in his family properties?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly